

1 LANCE P. MAISS
Nevada Bar No.: 4683
2 ARMSTRONG TEASDALE, LLP
50 West Liberty Street, Suite 950
3 Reno, Nevada 89501
4 Telephone No.: (775) 322-7400
Facsimile No.: (775) 322-9049
5 Email No.: lmaiss@armstrongteasdale.com
6 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
10

11 DOMINO'S PIZZA FRANCHISING
LLC, a Delaware limited liability
12 company; and DOMINO'S PIZZA
MASTER ISSUER LLC, a Delaware
13 limited liability company,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 CALVIN YEAGER, an individual;
VALLEY PIZZA, INC., a Nevada
17 corporation; and LAKESIDE PIZZA,
INC., a California corporation,
18

19 Defendants.
20
21

CASE NO. 3:10-CV-560

**MOTION FOR ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE WHY MATTHEW
MATTLOCK, MELISSA YEAGER, AND
PRONTO PIZZA, INC. SHOULD NOT
BE HELD IN CONTEMPT OF COURT**

22 COMES NOW, plaintiffs DOMINO'S PIZZA FRANCHISING LLC and
23 DOMINO'S PIZZA MASTER ISSUER LLC (collectively, "Domino's"), by and through
24 their counsel, Armstrong Teasdale LLP, hereby move this Court for an order to show
25 cause why Matthew Matlock, Melissa Yeager, and Pronto Pizza, Inc. should not be held in
26 contempt for failing to: (1) return the Operations Manual; (2) return the Customer List;
27
28

1 and (3) transfer the telephone number 775-265-2929, pursuant to this Court's Order, dated
2 November 18, 2010 ("Enforcement Order").

3 This motion is based upon Fed.R.Civ.P 65 and 70, the Points and Authorities
4 attached hereto, and such further argument the Court may permit.
5

6
7 DATED this 25th day of April, 2011.
8

9 ARMSTRONG TEASDALE, LLP
10

11
12 By: Lance P. Maiss
13 LANCE P. MAISS
14 50 W. Liberty Street, Ste. 950
15 Reno, NV 89501
16 Telephone No.: (775) 322-7400
17 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **INTRODUCTION**

3
4 This matter involves a dispute between a franchisor and franchisee, in which Final
5 Judgment has already been rendered in the United States District Court for the Eastern
6 District of Michigan ("Michigan Federal Court") in favor of Domino's, the franchisers of
7 the well-known pizza delivery business bearing the "DOMINO'S PIZZA" name and logo.

8
9 Defendants Calvin Yeager, Valley Pizza, Inc. ("Valley") and Lakeside Pizza, Inc.
10 ("Lakeside") had been the owner and operator of franchises of Domino's. Yeager is
11 President of both Valley and Lakeside. After defaulting on Franchise Agreements with
12 Domino's, on or about November 13, 2009, Domino's terminated the Franchise
13 Agreements with defendants.
14

15 Subsequently, defendants failed to comply with post-term obligations contained in
16 the Franchise Agreements. As a result, on January 25, 2010, Domino's obtained a
17 preliminary injunction against defendants, requiring defendants to comply with the post-
18 term obligations ("Injunction Order"). This time, defendants ignored the Injunction
19 Order. Thereafter, Domino's obtained its Final Judgment against defendants, which
20 included those acting in concert or privity with defendants.
21

22 After defendants ignored the Final Judgment, on November 18, 2010, Domino's
23 obtained from this Court the Enforcement Order, whereby Matthew Mattlock, Melissa
24 Yeager and/or Pronto Pizza, Inc. were held to have been acting in concert or privity with
25 defendants in failing to comply with the post-term obligations contained in the Franchise
26 Agreements between plaintiffs and defendants. This Court ordered Matthew Mattlock,
27
28

1 Melissa Yeager and/or Pronto Pizza, Inc. to transfer the telephone number 775-265-2929
2 to plaintiffs; and (2) return the Operations Manual and Customer List to plaintiffs, within
3 45 days of the Enforcement Order. Notice of Entry of Order was then filed and served
4 upon them.
5

6 Since that time, Matthew Mattlock, Melissa Yeager and Pronto Pizza, Inc. have
7 failed to comply with this Court's Enforcement Order.
8

9 ARGUMENT

10 I. CONTEMPT OF COURT ORDERS

11 A district court has wide latitude in determining whether there has been a
12 contemptuous defense of its order. *Gifford v. Heckler*, 741 F.2d 263, 266 (9th Cir. 1984).
13 To avoid sanctions for contempt, disobedient parties must show that they took all
14 reasonable steps within their power to insure compliance with the court's order. *Stone v.*
15 *City and County of San Francisco*, 968 F.2d 850, 856 (9th Cir. 1992).
16

17 Fed.R.Civ.P. 65(d)(2)(C) provides that other persons who are in active concert or
18 participation with the parties are bound by the injunction order. Thus, nonparties to a
19 lawsuit are not inoculated against charges of civil contempt if they knowingly aid or abet
20 an enjoined party in transgressing a court order. *Goya Foods, Inc. v. Wallack Management*
21 *Co.*, 290 F.3d 63, 75 (1st Cir. 2002). Moreover, Fed.R.Civ.P. 70 gives the district court a
22 discrete and limited power to deal with parties who thwart final judgments by refusing to
23 comply with orders to perform specific acts. *Analytical Engineering Inc. v. Baldwin*
24 *Filters, Inc.*, 425 F.3d 443, 449 (7th Cir. 2005). Rule 70(e) actually provides that the court
25 may hold the disobedient party in contempt. Finally, Fed.R.Civ.P. 71 provides that:
26
27
28

When an order grants relief for a nonparty or may be enforced against a nonparty, the procedures for enforcing the order is the same as for a party.

Thus, when an injunction is addressed to a nonparty and he is given notice of the injunction, Rule 71 permits a district court to use “the same processes for enforcing obedience to the order as if [he were] a party,” such as holding him in contempt for violating it. *Irwin v. Mascott*, 370 F.3d 924, 931 (9th Cir. 2004).

II. HAVING IGNORED THE ENFORCEMENT ORDER, THIS COURT MUST ISSUE AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY MATTHEW MATTLOCK, MELISSA YEAGER, AND PRONTO PIZZA, INC. SHOULD NOT BE HELD IN CONTEMPT AND SUBJECT TO SANCTIONS

In the case at bar, the Enforcement Order was properly issued by this Court and served upon Matthew Mattlock, Melissa Yeager, and Pronto Pizza, Inc.¹ To date, there has been no compliance with the Enforcement Order. In fact, there has been no response whatsoever by them. Instead, Domino’s has been denied its rights under its Franchise Agreements, the Injunction Order, and Final Judgment, and now the Enforcement Order, all the while incurring attorney’s fees and expenses. As a result, this Court must properly issue an Order to Show Cause why Matthew Mattlock, Melissa Yeager, and Pronto Pizza, Inc. should not be held in contempt and subject to sanctions.

CONCLUSION

Domino’s has been trying to enforce its rights as the Franchisor for several years. Through an Injunction Order, a Final Judgment, and now the Enforcement Order, Domino’s has been denied its rights under the law. Therefore, Matthew Mattlock, Melissa

¹ Mattlock and Pronto Pizza have been previously served with the Injunction Order and Final Judgment as well.

1 Yeager, and Pronto Pizza, Inc., must be ordered before this Court to determine why they
2 should not be held in contempt and subject to sanctions.

3 DATED this 25th day of April, 2011.
4

5
6 ARMSTRONG TEASDALE, LLP
7

8
9 By: Lance P. Maiss
10 LANCE P. MAISS
11 50 W. Liberty Street, Ste. 950
12 Reno, NV 89501
13 Telephone No.: (775) 322-7400
14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Zabett Buzzone, declare that:

I am over 18 years of age and not a party to, or interested in, the within entitled action. I am an employee of Armstrong Teasdale, LLP located at 50 West Liberty Street, Suite 950, Reno, Nevada, 89501.

On, April 25, 2011 I served the following document:

MOTION FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY MATTHEW MATTLOCK, MELISSA YEAGER AND PRONTO PIZZA, INC., SHOULD NOT BE HELD IN CONTEMPT OF COURT

[X] BY MAIL [N.R.C.P. 5(b)] I caused each envelope to be placed for deposit with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope, with postage prepaid, and that each envelope was placed for collection and mailing on that date following ordinary business. I am readily familiar with the business practice at my place of business for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service. Correspondence so collected and processed is deposited with the U.S. Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit;

Calvin Yeager
987 Edgewood Circle
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Pronto Pizza
1281 Kimmerling Road, Suite 18-A
Gardnerville, NV 89460

Melissa Yeager
1281 Kimmerling Road, Suite 18-A
Gardnerville, NV 89460

Mathew Mattlock
1281 Kimmerling Road, Suite 18-A
Gardnerville, NV 89460

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

Zabett Buzzone
Zabett Buzzone